

REMARKS

The present Amendment cancels claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 and adds new claims 11-13. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 11-13.

Claim 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. As indicated above, claim 9 was canceled. Therefore, this rejection is rendered moot.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,117) in view of Jacobs (U.S. Patent No. 6,225,995); and claims 3 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs and further in view of Fujita. As indicated above, claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections are rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 was not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants part that the features recited in claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 are taught or suggested by Fujita or Jacobs. The cancellation of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the present application. Applicants hereby reserve their right to pursue the invention as set forth in claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 in a continuing application.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 11-13. New claims 11-13 are directed to a database management method implemented in database management system, a computer program stored

on a storage medium for conducting database management in a database management system and the database management system itself. The features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. Thus, none of the references of record anticipate nor rendered obvious the features of the present invention as recited in claims 11-13. Particularly, the features of the present invention as recited in new claims 11-13 are not rendered obvious by Fujita or Jacobs, whether taken individually or in combination.

Jacobs, in col. 8, line 15-33 refers to PL/SQL runtime and a Java runtime interpreter as an example of a cartridge. In col. 8, lines 28-30, there is described "The Java runtime interpreter cartridge enables web application developers to write server-side JAVA applications to process browser requests." This means that the web application developers can write the server-side JAVA applications. However, Jacob's server-side is not a server in a DBMS (database Management System), but a web application server (Fig.2, 280). Thus, the server-side JAVA applications are not JAVA stored programs.

Fujita discloses a resource manager RM which performs resource management in a transaction processing. The resource manager receives a resource release request or a resource acquisition request and implements a resource release processing or a resource acquiring processing according to the received request. A two-phase lock system is employed in which once acquisition of a resource starts locking of the resource is continued, while

once release of locking of the resource starts the release condition is continued. (See col. 7, line 50 to col. 8, line 6).

In contrast, the present invention as recited in the claims provides that on a resource reserved in an SQL execution environment before the SQL execution environment calls a program execution environment, when use of a resource reserved by execution of the program execution environment is terminated the resource is released, but the resource continues to be reserved as per the present invention. For operation tables of those resources, there are provided a resource managing table and a release resource managing table.

Fujita provides a resource managing table which corresponds to a resource acquiring table 11. However, Fujita does not teach or suggest anything equivalent to Applicants' release resource managing table as recited in the claims.

Therefore, the present invention essentially differs from Fujita by Applicants resource releasing process of no longer releasing any resource registered in the release resource managing table among the resources registered in the resource managing table in releasing resources.

The above described deficiencies of Fujita are also evident in Jacobs. Particularly, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Jacobs of Applicants resource releasing process of no longer releasing any resource registered in the release resource managing table among the resources registered in the resource managing table in releasing resources as recited in the claims.

Thus, both Fujita and Jacobs fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now recited in new claims 11-13.

Therefore, since both Fujita and Jacobs fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims, the combination of Fujita and Jacobs does not render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of Jacobs is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 11-13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 11-13 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.41052X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120